UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,740	03/12/2004	Barry Christopher Allyn	06576.105021 (MS# 150877.	9224

45979 7590 06/26/2006

PERKINS COIE LLP/MSFT
P. O. BOX 1247
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER	
SINGH, RACHNA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/799,740	ALLYN, BARRY CHRISTOPHER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rachna Singh	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 April 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-44,46-53 and 55-67* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-44,46-53 and 55-67* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 March 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/12/06 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-44, 46-53, and 55-67 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 19, 28, 36, 47, 55, 60, 66, and 67 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: There appears to be a typographical error on line 16. It appears that "preferred sition" should read "preferred position". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-20, 22-29, 31-38, 40-48, 50-62, and 64-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryan et al, US 6,124,856, 09/26/00 (filed 04/24/96) in view of Chew, US 5,640,498, 06/17/97.

In reference to claims 1 and 11, Bryan teaches a method and apparatus for displaying modeless bar interfaces in a computer system. See title and abstract. Compare to ***"a method in a computer system for displaying modeless windows"***. Bryan discloses the following:

-Displaying an application window having a client area. See figure 2 and 3A-3D. Compare to ***"displaying an application window having a client area"***.

-Displaying a document window within the client area. See figure 3A where a user interface comprising a document viewing region 312 is shown. See also column 5, lines 50-65. Compare to ***"within the client area, displaying a document window"***.

-Representing modeless function interfaces or bars displayable by the application. See column 5, lines 38-67; column 6, lines 1-52; Figures 3A-3E. The modeless bar is anchored to the edge of the document window in figures 3A and 3E. The modeless bar contains titles of the menu options which are in a collapsed state. See figures 3A-3E and column 6, lines 1-51. Upon selection of a menu option, the modeless function

object is initiated and the document currently open has its own copy of the modeless function interface. Compare to ***"displaying a modeless window in the document window anchored to an edge of the document window, the anchored modeless window having at least a collapsed and expanded states".***

-When a modeless window has not yet been selected, it is in a collapsed state where only the menu name is displayed. See figure 3A, bar 308 and figures 3B-3E. See also column 6, lines 1-50. Compare to ***"when the modeless window is in the collapsed state, displaying its identifier without displaying its content"***.

-Upon a selection of a menu option, the initiation of the modeless function object occurs. The display tool enables simultaneous display of the different modeless bar interfaces within the same document view without obstructing other modeless windows. See figures 3A-3D and column 6, lines 46-52 and lines 1-45. Compare to ***"user input is received to the collapsed modeless window, determining a preferred position of the modeless window based upon its size in the expanded state, the preferred position calculated to prevent the modeless window from overlapping another modeless window"***.

-The modeless windows are displayed in an expanded state without obstruction of other modeless windows and is anchored to the edge of a document window as depicted in figure 3E. See also column 6. Compare to ***"expanding the collapsed modeless***

window so that it is in the expanded state and anchored to the edge of the document window based on the preferred position".

-The modeless windows include information regarding the document such as a help function, table of content, review functions, etc. See column 6, lines 17-35 and figure 3E. Compare to ***"displaying information associated with the application within the expanded modeless window".***

Bryan teaches receiving user input in order to expand a modeless window; however, he does not teach that when user input is received ***proximate*** or ***when user input is received that is not proximate to the expanded modeless window, collapsing the expanded modeless window so that it is in the collapsed state.***

Chew teaches an accessbar arbiter with an autohide function. An accessbar is anchored to the edge of a display and appears on the display at a given time. See column 1, lines 30-40. An accessbar can be a taskbar that is visible to a user interface element and informs a user of which tasks are active and have an active window. The taskbar is constructed so that it does not obscured by other open windows. The taskbar is anchored at fixed location on the user interface. See column 3, lines 10-35 and figure 2A. A taskbar or accessbar has an autohide property associated with it. An autohide property refers to when an accessbar is initially presented to a user in an invisible state as shown in figure 2E. When invisible, instead of displaying the accessbar, a "hotbar",

226, is displayed. The hotbar acts as a mechanism for displaying an accessbar in a visible manner. When a user moves a mouse cursor towards the hotbar, the accessbar reappears and becomes visible to the user. As the user moves away, the accessbar becomes invisible again. See columns 5, lines 25-67 and column 6, lines 1-4. Compare to ***when user input is received that is proximate, expanding the window*** and ***when user input is received that is not proximate to the window, collapsing the window so that it is in its collapsed state.***

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chew's autohide function in the system of Bryan's display of modeless windows because it was desirable at the time of the invention to prevent one screen object from negatively affecting another screen object. An accessbar or window that is consistently visible to a user may obstruct the views of other accessbars or windows because there is no limit to the number of accessbars or windows that can appear on a display at any given time. Thus it was desirable at the time of the invention to provide an "autohide" feature with regards to accessbars or windows that did not need to be displayed at that time in order to prevent conflict with other screen objects. See abstract of Chew.

In reference to claims 2 and 12, Bryan teaches updating information in the modeless window based on the document displayed. For example, one of the modeless windows is for a grammar check. If the document content has changed, then

the information in the modeless window would change to reflect changes made in the document that would require a new grammar check. See figure 3E.

In reference to claim 4, Bryan teaches that the modeless window can be displayed in the same document view. The document currently open by the word processing application may have its own copy of the modeless interface. See column 6, lines 9-16.

In reference to claims 5 and 14, Bryan teaches the modeless windows are related to the document window and provide functions such as grammar check functions, review functions, and merge functions for the document. A child window is simply a window related to a parent window.

In reference to claims 6 and 15, Bryan teaches displaying multiple modeless windows related to the document application. See figure 3E.

In reference to claim 7, Bryan teaches displaying multiple modeless windows in a manner so that there is no obstruction or overlap.

In reference to claims 8-9 and 16-17, Bryan teaches that upon a selection of a menu option, the initiation of the modeless function object expansion occurs. See figures 3A-3D and column 6, lines 46-52 and lines 1-45. Bryan teaches collapsing the

modeless window by depressing, with a mouse, the "done" button on the modeless window as depicted in figures 3B-3D. Expanding or collapsing a window entails changing the size of the window.

In reference to claims 10 and 18, Bryan does not teach expanding or collapsing a window based on the position of user input. However, Chew teaches an accessbar arbiter with an autohide function. An accessbar is anchored to the edge of a display and appears on the display at a given time. See column 1, lines 30-40. An accessbar can be a taskbar that is visible to a user interface element and informs a user of which tasks are active and have an active window. The taskbar is constructed so that it does not obscured by other open windows. The taskbar is anchored at fixed location on the user interface. See column 3, lines 10-35 and figure 2A. A taskbar or accessbar has an autohide property associated with it. An autohide property refers to when an accessbar is initially presented to a user in an invisible state as shown in figure 2E. When invisible, instead of displaying the accessbar, a "hotbar", 226, is displayed. The hotbar acts as a mechanism for displaying an accessbar in a visible manner. When a user moves a mouse cursor towards the hotbar, the accessbar reappears and becomes visible to the user. As the user moves away, the accessbar becomes invisible again. See columns 5, lines 25-67 and column 6, lines 1-4.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chew's autohide function in the system of Bryan's display of modeless windows because it was desirable at the time of the

invention to prevent one screen object from negatively affecting another screen object. An accessbar or window that is consistently visible to a user may obstruct the views of other accessbars or windows because there is no limit to the number of accessbars or windows that can appear on a display at any given time. Thus it was desirable at the time of the invention to provide an "autohide" feature with regards to accessbars or windows that did not need to be displayed at that time in order to prevent conflict with other screen objects. See abstract of Chew.

In reference to claims 19 and 28, Bryan teaches a method and apparatus for displaying modeless bar interfaces in a computer system. See title and abstract. Compare to ***"a method in a computer system for displaying modeless windows"***. Bryan discloses the following:

-Displaying an application window having a client area. See figure 2 and 3A-3D. Compare to ***"displaying an application window having a client area"***.

-Displaying a document window within the client area. See figure 3A where a user interface comprising a document viewing region 312 is shown. See also column 5, lines 50-65. Compare to ***"within the client area, displaying a document window"***.

-Representing multiple modeless function interfaces or bars displayable by the application. See column 5, lines 38-67; column 6, lines 1-52; Figures 3A-3E. The

modeless bar is anchored to the edge of the document window in figures 3A and 3E. The modeless window allows a user to interact with the window without requiring a user to open or close the window each time it is used. It can remain in a suspended state until resumed by the user. See column 1, lines 30-48. Modeless windows, unlike modal windows, do not require user action before the user can interact with the document window. Upon selection of a menu option, the modeless function object is initiated and the document currently open has its own copy of the modeless function interface. The display tool enables simultaneous display of the different modeless bar interfaces within the same document view without obstructing other modeless windows. See figures 3A-3D and column 6, lines 46-52 and lines 1-45. The modeless windows include information regarding the document such as a help function, table of content, review functions, etc. See column 6, lines 17-35 and figure 3E. Compare to ***"displaying a first and second modeless window in the document window that does not prevent functionality of the document window after being selected and that within it displays information associated with the application".***

Bryan teaches that upon a selection of a menu option, the initiation of the modeless function object occurs. The display tool enables simultaneous display of the different modeless bar interfaces within the same document view *without obstructing* other modeless windows. See figures 3A-3D and column 6, lines 46-52 and lines 1-45. Once a new object is added to the display, the various objects are rearranged so that they do not overlap. See column 7, lines 54-60. A user can manually resize the display

which would require resizing of all objects. While Bryan teaches a user can manually resize the display, he does not necessarily teach receiving a window movement command from a user.

Chew teaches a system that governs the location of an accessbar or taskbar by receiving requests for proposed locations and granting the request if the location does not conflict with another accessbar. If a conflict does occur, another location is provided. See abstract. Compare to ***"moving the present location of the first modeless window if a window movement command from a user is received that causes the second modeless window to be moved to a position that would overlap a preferred location of the first modeless window"***.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chew's moving a window location in the system of Bryan's display of modeless windows because it was desirable at the time of the invention to prevent one screen object from negatively affecting another screen object. An accessbar or window that is consistently visible to a user may obstruct the views of other accessbars or windows because there is no limit to the number of accessbars or windows that can appear on a display at any given time. Thus it was desirable at the time of the invention to provide a means to move the location of windows in order to prevent conflict with other screen objects. See abstract of Chew.

In reference to claims 20 and 29, Bryan teaches a user can double click on a menu item to initiate the display of a modeless function object.

In reference to claims 22 and 31, Bryan teaches that the modeless window can be displayed in the same document view. The document currently open by the word processing application may have its own copy of the modeless interface. See column 6, lines 9-16.

In reference to claim 23, Bryan teaches the modeless window is anchored to the edge of a document window. See figure 3E.

In reference to claims 24 and 32, Bryan teaches the modeless windows are related to the document window and provide functions such as grammar check functions, review functions, and merge functions for the document. A child window is simply a window related to a parent window.

In reference to claims 25-26 and 33-34, Bryan teaches that upon a selection of a menu option, the initiation of the modeless function object expansion occurs. See figures 3A-3D and column 6, lines 46-52 and lines 1-45. Bryan teaches collapsing the

modeless window by depressing, with a mouse, the "done" button on the modeless window as depicted in figures 3B-3D. Expanding or collapsing a window entails changing the size of the window.

In reference to claims 27 and 35, Bryan does not teach expanding or collapsing a window based on the position of user input. However, Chew teaches an accessbar arbiter with an autohide function. An accessbar is anchored to the edge of a display and appears on the display at a given time. See column 1, lines 30-40. An accessbar can be a taskbar that is visible to a user interface element and informs a user of which tasks are active and have an active window. The taskbar is constructed so that it does not obscured by other open windows. The taskbar is anchored at fixed location on the user interface. See column 3, lines 10-35 and figure 2A. A taskbar or accessbar has an autohide property associated with it. An autohide property refers to when an accessbar is initially presented to a user in an invisible state as shown in figure 2E. When invisible, instead of displaying the accessbar, a "hotbar", 226, is displayed. The hotbar acts as a mechanism for displaying an accessbar in a visible manner. When a user moves a mouse cursor towards the hotbar, the accessbar reappears and becomes visible to the user. As the user moves away, the accessbar becomes invisible again. See columns 5, lines 25-67 and column 6, lines 1-4.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chew's autohide function in the system of Bryan's display of modeless windows because it was desirable at the time of the

invention to prevent one screen object from negatively affecting another screen object. An accessbar or window that is consistently visible to a user may obstruct the views of other accessbars or windows because there is no limit to the number of accessbars or windows that can appear on a display at any given time. Thus it was desirable at the time of the invention to provide an "autohide" feature with regards to accessbars or windows that did not need to be displayed at that time in order to prevent conflict with other screen objects. See abstract of Chew.

In reference to claims 36 and 47, Bryan teaches a method and apparatus for displaying modeless bar interfaces in a computer system. See title and abstract. Compare to ***"a method in a computer system for displaying modeless windows"***. Bryan discloses the following:

-Displaying an application window having a client area. See figure 2 and 3A-3D. Compare to ***"displaying an application window having a client area"***.

-Displaying a document window within the client area. See figure 3A where a user interface comprising a document viewing region 312 is shown. See also column 5, lines 50-65. Compare to ***"within the client area, displaying a document window"***.

-Representing modeless function interfaces or bars displayable by the application. See column 5, lines 38-67; column 6, lines 1-52; Figures 3A-3E. The modeless bar is

anchored to the edge of the document window in figures 3A and 3E. The modeless bar contains titles of the menu options which are in a collapsed state. See figures 3A-3E and column 6, lines 1-51. Upon selection of a menu option, the modeless function object is initiated and expanded. See figure 3A-3E. The modeless windows include information regarding the document such as a help function, table of content, review functions, etc. See column 6, lines 17-35 and figure 3E. Compare to ***"displaying in the document window a modeless window in an expanded state that displays information regarding the application".***

-When a modeless window has not yet been selected, it is in a collapsed state where only the menu name is displayed. See figure 3A, bar 308 and figures 3B-3E. See also column 6, lines 1-50. When the menu names representing the modeless windows are selected by the user, the modeless window is displayed in an expanded state without obstruction of other modeless windows and is anchored to the edge of a document window as depicted in figure 3E. See also column 6. Compare to ***"collapsing the modeless window such that a title bar associated with the modeless window is displayed without displaying the information regarding the application"***

Bryan teaches receiving user input in order to expand a modeless window; however, he does not teach that collapsing the window ***when user input selects a display position of the document window that is not near the modeless window and the collapsed modeless window is expanded when user input selects a***

display position of the document window that is near the collapsed modeless window.

Chew teaches an accessbar arbiter with an autohide function. An accessbar is anchored to the edge of a display and appears on the display at a given time. See column 1, lines 30-40. An accessbar can be a taskbar that is visible to a user interface element and informs a user of which tasks are active and have an active window. The taskbar is constructed so that it does not obscured by other open windows. The taskbar is anchored at fixed location on the user interface. See column 3, lines 10-35 and figure 2A. A taskbar or accessbar has an autohide property associated with it. An autohide property refers to when an accessbar is initially presented to a user in an invisible state as shown in figure 2E. When invisible, instead of displaying the accessbar, a "hotbar", 226, is displayed. The hotbar acts as a mechanism for displaying an accessbar in a visible manner. When a user moves a mouse cursor towards the hotbar, the accessbar reappears and becomes visible to the user. As the user moves away, the accessbar becomes invisible again. See columns 5, lines 25-67 and column 6, lines 1-4. Compare to ***when user input selects a display position of the document window that is not near the modeless window and the collapsed modeless window is expanded when user input selects a display position of the document window that is near the collapsed modeless window.***

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chew's autohide function in the system of Bryan's display of modeless windows because it was desirable at the time of the invention to prevent one screen object from negatively affecting another screen object. An accessbar or window that is consistently visible to a user may obstruct the views of other accessbars or windows because there is no limit to the number of accessbars or windows that can appear on a display at any given time. Thus it was desirable at the time of the invention to provide an "autohide" feature with regards to accessbars or windows that did not need to be displayed at that time in order to prevent conflict with other screen objects. See abstract of Chew.

In reference to claim 37, Chew teaches receiving user input via a mouse. See columns 5, lines 25-67 and column 6, lines 1-4. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chew's autohide function in the system of Bryan's display of modeless windows because it was desirable at the time of the invention to prevent one screen object from negatively affecting another screen object. An accessbar or window that is consistently visible to a user may obstruct the views of other accessbars or windows because there is no limit to the number of accessbars or windows that can appear on a display at any given time. Thus it was desirable at the time of the invention to provide an "autohide" feature with regards to accessbars or windows that did not need to be displayed at that time in order to prevent conflict with other screen objects. See abstract of Chew.

In reference to claims 38 and 48, Bryan teaches updating information in the modeless window based on the document displayed. For example, one of the modeless windows is for a grammar check. If the document content has changed, then the information in the modeless window would change to reflect changes made in the document that would require a new grammar check. See figure 3E.

In reference to claim 40, Bryan teaches that the modeless window can be displayed in the same document view. The document currently open by the word processing application may have its own copy of the modeless interface. See column 6, lines 9-16.

In reference to claims 41 and 50, Bryan teaches the modeless window is anchored to the edge of a document window. See figure 3E.

In reference to claims 42 and 51, Bryan teaches displaying multiple modeless windows related to the document application. See figure 3E.

In reference to claim 43, Bryan teaches displaying multiple modeless windows in a manner so that there is no obstruction or overlap.

In reference to claims 44 and 52, Bryan teaches that upon a selection of a menu option, the initiation of the modeless function object expansion occurs. See figures 3A-

3D and column 6, lines 46-52 and lines 1-45. Bryan teaches collapsing the modeless window by depressing, with a mouse, the "done" button on the modeless window as depicted in figures 3B-3D. Expanding or collapsing a window entails changing the size of the window.

In reference to claim 46, Bryan teaches the modeless windows are related to the document window and provide functions such as grammar check functions, review functions, and merge functions for the document. A child window is simply a window related to a parent window.

In reference to claim 53, Chew teaches receiving user input via a mouse. See columns 5, lines 25-67 and column 6, lines 1-4. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chew's autohide function in the system of Bryan's display of modeless windows because it was desirable at the time of the invention to prevent one screen object from negatively affecting another screen object. An accessbar or window that is consistently visible to a user may obstruct the views of other accessbars or windows because there is no limit to the number of accessbars or windows that can appear on a display at any given time. Thus it was desirable at the time of the invention to provide an "autohide" feature with regards to accessbars or windows that did not need to be displayed at that time in order to prevent conflict with other screen objects. See abstract of Chew.

In reference to claims 55 and 60, Bryan teaches a method and apparatus for displaying modeless bar interfaces in a computer system. See title and abstract. Bryan discloses the following:

-Representing multiple modeless function interfaces or bars displayable by the application. See column 5, lines 38-67; column 6, lines 1-52; Figures 3A-3E. The modeless bar is anchored to the edge of the document window in figures 3A and 3E. The modeless window allows a user to interact with the window without requiring a user to open or close the window each time it is used. It can remain in a suspended state until resumed by the user. See column 1, lines 30-48. Modeless windows, unlike modal windows, do not require user action before the user can interact with the document window. Upon selection of a menu option, the modeless function object is initiated and the document currently open has its own copy of the modeless function interface. The display tool enables simultaneous display of the different modeless bar interfaces within the same document view without obstructing other modeless windows. See figures 3A-3D and column 6, lines 46-52 and lines 1-45. The modeless windows include information regarding the document such as a help function, table of content, review functions, etc. See column 6, lines 17-35 and figure 3E. Compare to ***"displaying a first and second modeless window that does not prevent functionality of the document window after being selected and that contains information about the computer program to the user, the modeless child window having a preferred location"***

-The display tool enables simultaneous display of the different modeless bar interfaces within the same document view without obstructing other modeless windows. See figures 3A-3D and column 6, lines 46-52 and lines 1-45. Compare to ***"anchoring the first modeless child window in a position that does not interfere with the preferred location of the second modeless child window"***.

Bryan teaches that upon a selection of a menu option, the initiation of the modeless function object occurs. The display tool enables simultaneous display of the different modeless bar interfaces within the same document view *without obstructing* other modeless windows. See figures 3A-3D and column 6, lines 46-52 and lines 1-45. Once a new object is added to the display, the various objects are rearranged so that they do not overlap. See column 7, lines 54-60. A user can manually resize the display which would require resizing of all objects. While Bryan teaches a user can manually resize the display, he does not necessarily teach receiving a window movement command from a user that causes the second modeless window to be moved to a position that would overlap the first modeless window in its preferred location.

Chew teaches a system that governs the location of an accessbar or taskbar by receiving requests for proposed locations and granting the request if the location does not conflict with another accessbar. If a conflict does occur, another location is provided. See abstract. Compare to ***"receiving a window movement command***

from a user that causes the second modeless child window to be moved to a position in which it would overlap the first child window in its preferred location; in response to determining that the second modeless window would overlap the first modeless window, moving the first modeless window to a new location in which the second modeless window does not overlap the first modeless window".

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chew's moving a window location in the system of Bryan's display of modeless windows because it was desirable at the time of the invention to prevent one screen object from negatively affecting another screen object. An accessbar or window that is consistently visible to a user may obstruct the views of other accessbars or windows because there is no limit to the number of accessbars or windows that can appear on a display at any given time. Thus it was desirable at the time of the invention to provide a means to move the location of windows in order to prevent conflict with other screen objects. See abstract of Chew.

In reference to claims 56-57, Bryan does not teach closing and opening the modeless window responsive to user input; however, Chew teaches an accessbar arbiter with an autohide function. An accessbar is anchored to the edge of a display and appears on the display at a given time. See column 1, lines 30-40. An accessbar can be a taskbar that is visible to a user interface element and informs a user of which

tasks are active and have an active window. The taskbar is constructed so that it does not obscured by other open windows. The taskbar is anchored at fixed location on the user interface. See column 3, lines 10-35 and figure 2A. A taskbar or accessbar has an autohide property associated with it. An autohide property refers to when an accessbar is initially presented to a user in an invisible state as shown in figure 2E. When invisible, instead of displaying the accessbar, a "hotbar", 226, is displayed. The hotbar acts as a mechanism for displaying an accessbar in a visible manner. When a user moves a mouse cursor towards the hotbar, the accessbar reappears and becomes visible to the user. As the user moves away, the accessbar becomes invisible again. See columns 5, lines 25-67 and column 6, lines 1-4.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chew's autohide function in the system of Bryan's display of modeless windows because it was desirable at the time of the invention to prevent one screen object from negatively affecting another screen object. An accessbar or window that is consistently visible to a user may obstruct the views of other accessbars or windows because there is no limit to the number of accessbars or windows that can appear on a display at any given time. Thus it was desirable at the time of the invention to provide an "autohide" feature with regards to accessbars or windows that did not need to be displayed at that time in order to prevent conflict with other screen objects. See abstract of Chew.

In reference to claim 58, Bryan teaches both modeless windows are anchored. See figures 3A-3B.

In reference to claim 59, Chew teaches receiving user input via a mouse. See columns 5, lines 25-67 and column 6, lines 1-4.

In reference to claim 61, Bryan teaches updating information in the modeless window based on the document displayed. For example, one of the modeless windows is for a grammar check. If the document content has changed, then the information in the modeless window would change to reflect changes made in the document that would require a new grammar check. See figure 3E.

In reference to claim 62, Bryan does not teach closing and opening the modeless window responsive to user input; however, Chew teaches an accessbar arbiter with an autohide function. An accessbar is anchored to the edge of a display and appears on the display at a given time. See column 1, lines 30-40. An accessbar can be a taskbar that is visible to a user interface element and informs a user of which tasks are active and have an active window. The taskbar is constructed so that it does not obscured by other open windows. The taskbar is anchored at fixed location on the user interface. See column 3, lines 10-35 and figure 2A. A taskbar or accessbar has an autohide property associated with it. An autohide property refers to when an accessbar is initially presented to a user in an invisible state as shown in figure 2E. When invisible, instead of displaying the accessbar, a "hotbar", 226, is displayed. The hotbar acts as a

mechanism for displaying an accessbar in a visible manner. When a user moves a mouse cursor towards the hotbar, the accessbar reappears and becomes visible to the user. As the user moves away, the accessbar becomes invisible again. See columns 5, lines 25-67 and column 6, lines 1-4.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chew's autohide function in the system of Bryan's display of modeless windows because it was desirable at the time of the invention to prevent one screen object from negatively affecting another screen object. An accessbar or window that is consistently visible to a user may obstruct the views of other accessbars or windows because there is no limit to the number of accessbars or windows that can appear on a display at any given time. Thus it was desirable at the time of the invention to provide an "autohide" feature with regards to accessbars or windows that did not need to be displayed at that time in order to prevent conflict with other screen objects. See abstract of Chew.

In reference to claim 63, Bryan teaches collapsing the window by pressing "done" as depicted in figures 3B-3D. Clicking on "done" will collapse the window such that it is not at the edge of the display window. See figures 3A and 3E.

In reference to claims 64-65, Chew teaches receiving user input via a mouse. See columns 5, lines 25-67 and column 6, lines 1-4.

6. Claims 3, 13, 21, 30, 39 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryan et al, US 6,124,856, 09/26/00 (filed 04/24/96) in view of Chew, US 5,640,498, 06/17/97, as applied to claims 1, 11, 19, 28, 36, 47, 55, and 60 above, and further in view of Bronson, US 5,305,435, 04/19/94.

In reference to claims 3 and 13, Bryan does not teach that the document window is adjacent to at least two of the sides of the modeless window; however, Bronson does. Bronson teaches a window system in which a window can be expanded and collapsed within a document window. When in an "expanded" state, the window has at least two sides adjacent to the document window. See figures 4 and 5 that show the collapsed and expanded state of a window in a document. See also columns 1-3. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the features of Bronson in the modeless window display system of Bryan because it was desirable to maximize screen display of windows in an application program regardless of the modality. Furthermore, having an "active" and "inactive" display mode (or expanded and collapsed mode) would maximize the display area for the document window. See columns 1-3 of Bronson.

In reference to claims 21 and 30, Bryan does not teach that the document window is adjacent to at least two of the sides of the modeless window; however, Bronson does. Bronson teaches a window system in which a window can be expanded and collapsed within a document window. When in an "expanded" state, the window

has at least two sides adjacent to the document window. See figures 4 and 5 that show the collapsed and expanded state of a window in a document. See also columns 1-3. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the features of Bronson in the modeless window display system of Bryan because it was desirable to maximize screen display of windows in an application program regardless of the modality. Furthermore, having an "active" and "inactive" display mode (or expanded and collapsed mode) would maximize the display area for the document window. See columns 1-3 of Bronson.

In reference to claims 39 and 49, Bryan does not teach that the document window is adjacent to at least two of the sides of the modeless window; however, Bronson does. Bronson teaches a window system in which a window can be expanded and collapsed within a document window. When in an "expanded" state, the window has at least two sides adjacent to the document window. See figures 4 and 5 that show the collapsed and expanded state of a window in a document. See also columns 1-3. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the features of Bronson in the modeless window display system of Bryan because it was desirable to maximize screen display of windows in an application program regardless of the modality. Furthermore, having an "active" and "inactive" display mode (or expanded and collapsed mode) would maximize the display area for the document window. See columns 1-3 of Bronson.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bryan et al, US 6,124,856, 09/26/00 (filed 04/24/96).

In reference to claim 66, Bryan teaches a method and apparatus for displaying modeless bar interfaces in a computer system. See title and abstract. Compare to ***"a computer system for displaying modeless windows"***. Bryan discloses the following:

-Displaying an application window having a client area. See figure 2 and 3A-3D. Compare to ***"a window display system that displays a window having a client area"***.

-Displaying a document window within the client area. See figure 3A where a user interface comprising a document viewing region 312 is shown. See also column 5, lines 50-65. Compare to ***"a second window display system that displays a document window within the client area"***.

-Representing modeless function interfaces or bars displayable by the application. See column 5, lines 38-67; column 6, lines 1-52; Figures 3A-3E. The modeless bar is anchored to the edge of the document window in figures 3A and 3E. The modeless window allows a user to interact with the window without requiring a user to open or close the window each time it is used. It can remain in a suspended state until resumed by the user. See column 1, lines 30-48. Modeless windows, unlike modal windows, do not require user action before the user can interact with the document window. Compare to ***"a third window display system that displays a modeless window that does not prevent functionality of the document window after being selected, and the third system displays the child window anchored to the edge of the document window"***.

-When a modeless window has not yet been selected, it is in a collapsed state where only the menu name is displayed. See figure 3A, bar 308 and figures 3B-3E. See also column 6, lines 1-50. Compare to ***"when the modeless window is in the collapsed state, displaying its identifier without displaying its content"***.

-Upon a selection of a menu option, the initiation of the modeless function object occurs. The display tool enables simultaneous display of the different modeless bar interfaces within the same document view without obstructing other modeless windows. See figures 3A-3D and column 6, lines 46-52 and lines 1-45. Compare to ***"determines a preferred position of the modeless child window based upon its size of its open state, even when the modeless window is in a collapsed state"***.

-The modeless windows include information regarding the document such as a help function, table of content, review functions, etc. See column 6, lines 17-35 and figure 3E. Compare to ***"a content display system that displays information associated regarding the application within the modeless child window"***.

In reference to claim 67, Bryan teaches a a method for displaying modeless bar interfaces. Bryan teaches:

- The display system includes modeless windows include information regarding the document in a word processing application program such as a help function, table of content, review functions, etc. See column 6, lines 17-35 and figure 3E. Compare to ***"a window display system that displays a modeless child window containing information about the computer program to the user"***.

- The modeless bar is anchored to the edge of the document window in figures 3A and 3E. Compare to ***"a window attacher for anchoring the modeless child window to an edge of the display window"***.

-Upon a selection of a menu option by a user, the initiation of the modeless function object occurs. The display tool enables simultaneous display of the different modeless bar interfaces within the same document view without obstructing other modeless windows. See figures 3A-3D and column 6, lines 46-52 and lines 1-45. Compare to ***"an opening process that opens the modeless child window responsive to input received from the user"***.

-A user can click on "Done" to close the modeless window. See figures 3B-3D. Compare to ***"a closing process that closes the child window responsive to other input received from the user"***.

- Upon a selection of a menu option, the initiation of the modeless function object occurs. The display tool enables simultaneous display of the different modeless bar interfaces within the same document view without obstructing other modeless windows. See figures 3A-3D and column 6, lines 46-52 and lines 1-45. Compare to ***"a preferred position process that determines a preferred position of the modeless child***

window based upon a size of its open state when the modeless window is in a collapsed state".

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments and amendments with respect to claims 1-67 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Pasquali	US 6,321,209 B1
Hullot et al.	US 5,146,556
Duperrouzel et al.	US 6,832,355
Fuller	US 5,179,653
Lazarony, Jr. et al.	US 5,870,091

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RS
05/16/06

/Heather R. Herndon/
HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CE[illegible]